

Remarks

The instant Office Action dated September 26, 2008 indicated that the drawings are objected to and that claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over applicant's admitted prior art ("APA", specification, page 1) in view of Tamai (U.S. Patent No. 6,580,180). Applicant traverses the rejections and, unless explicitly stated by the Applicant, does not acquiesce to any objection, rejection or averment made in the Office Action.

Regarding the objection to the drawings, Applicant respectfully maintains that the Examiner has failed to present a valid reason for the objection for the reasons presented in the Response dated August 20, 2008. Notwithstanding, in an effort to facilitate prosecution, Applicant has amended Figures 1 and 2 to provide the boxes with text labels as requested by the Examiner. No other changes have been made to Figures 1 and 2 and no new matter has been added. Thus, Applicant requests that the objection to the drawings be removed.

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-6 because the cited combination does not correspond to the claimed invention which includes, for example, aspects directed to a logic circuit that provides the on-off signal to the DC/DC converter in response to an idle state of the vehicle in which circuit elements that are supplied with power from the DC/DC converter are switched off. The Examiner acknowledges that APA does not disclose such a logic circuit. The cited portions of the Tamai reference, however, also do not teach a logic circuit that switches a DC/DC converter on and off in response to an idle state as claimed. Specifically, Tamai does not teach that voltage converter 120 (*i.e.*, the Examiner's alleged DC/DC converter) is controlled in response to the Examiner's alleged idle state (*i.e.*, when the ignition is turned on and the vehicle is not moving as stated on page 5 of the instant Office Action). Tamai's voltage converter 120 is controlled responsive to the amount of charge on battery 13 (*see, e.g.*, Figure 1 and Col. 6:21-34), instead of in response to the Examiner's idle state. In other words, Tamai's voltage converter 120 would function in the same manner regardless of whether the vehicle is moving or not (and regardless of what gear the transmission of the vehicle is in) because voltage converter 120 is not switched on and off in response to the Examiner's alleged idle state.

Moreover, Applicant traverses the Examiner's assertion that an "idle state" is not defined by the claims. *See, e.g.*, page 2 of the instant Office Action. Applicant submits that the claims do define the idle state, for example, claim 1 recites an idle state of the vehicle in which circuit elements that are supplied by DC output voltages are switched off. Regardless of the propriety of the Examiner's assertion, the cited portions of the Tamai reference do not teach that voltage converter 120 is controlled in response to the Examiner's alleged idle state as discussed above.

In view of the above, the cited combination does not correspond to the claimed invention. Accordingly, the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-6 is improper and Applicant respectfully requests that it be withdrawn.

Applicant further traverses the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-6 because the Examiner fails to provide a valid reason for the proposed combination of APA and the Tamai reference. This approach is contrary to the requirements of § 103 and relevant law. *See, e.g., KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1741 (U.S. 2007) ("A patent composed of several elements is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each element was, independently, known in the prior art."), and as discussed at <http://www.iptoday.com/articles/2007-09-nowotarski.asp>. In this instance, the Examiner asserts that the skilled artisan would combine Tamai's voltage converter 120 and MPU 110 with the converter arrangement disclosed in APA "in order to reduce power consumption by turning off the converter when it is not needed". *See, e.g.*, page 5 of the instant Office Action. As discussed above, the cited portions of Tamai teach that voltage converter 120 is used to charge second battery 13 responsive to the MPU 110 thereby reducing power consumption (*see, e.g.*, Col. 2:56-62); however, APA fails to mention any such second battery. *See, e.g.*, page 1:7-19 of Applicant's specification. As such, Applicant submits that the Examiner's proposed combination would not reduce power consumption due to the lack of a second battery in the proposed combination. Moreover, Applicant submits that even if the converter arrangement disclosed in APA did (or was modified to) include a second battery, the combination of APA and Tamai would result in the voltage converter 120 being controlled responsive to the amount of charge on the second battery 13 as taught by Tamai, instead of in response to an idle state as in the claimed invention.

In view of the above, the Examiner fails to provide a valid reason for the proposed combination. Accordingly, the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-6 is improper and Applicant respectfully requests that it be withdrawn

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, Peter Zawilski, of NXP Corporation at (408) 474-9063 (or the undersigned).

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Patent Counsel
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131

CUSTOMER NO. 65913

By: 

Name: Robert J. Crawford
Reg. No.: 32,122
651-686-6633
(NXPS.266PA)

Attachment: One Replacement Drawing Sheet